



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

so we set ourselves, several of us, conjointly and carefully to estimate the dimensions. I recorded at the time one as being, honestly estimated, '2 inches long,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches wide and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an inch thick,' these being rather the average than the extreme dimensions.

It then occurred to me to make an outline drawing of the largest by laying it flat upon a page of my pocket memorandum and carefully running a pencil around it. I secured, in this way, a rather rough but fairly accurate outline of two. These outlines have been exactly copied (including some lines due to a slipping of the block or to a different inclination of the pencil) and are given in the accompanying cuts. The extreme lengths of these will be found to be, respectively, about  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and 3 inches; their extreme breadths about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and 2 inches. The thickness of No. 1 was recorded at the time as being by estimate  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch; that of No. 2 as being one inch. I estimate their volumes as about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cubic inches for No. 1 and nearly 3 cubic inches for No. 2. The drawing of No. 2 was done more hastily, as just in the midst of it my train rushed in and I had to leave. But I took my trophy with me, and, with perhaps pardonable enthusiasm, paraded it through the cars, and, exhibiting it to the passengers, asked expressions of opinions from them as to its size relatively to that of a popular object of comparison, a guinea egg. Perhaps 20 or 30 passengers agreed, without dissent, that it was as large or larger. Some said, 'It is as large as a hen's egg;' all agreed, also, that they had never seen so large a hailstone before. Upon breaking it to pieces, I found a sort of nucleus, of somewhat less transparent ice at the center, but observed no concentric layers or other marked structure of any kind; it was quite solid and tolerably transparent throughout. Both of these stones were characterized by blunt points or projections, as shown in the figures; and the sides also, while flat in the main, were uneven with low, rounded elevations and depressions of the same sort, the general thickness being fairly uniform.

I think that very few of these stones or blocks fell. Perhaps they would have been a yard or two apart as they lay on the ground. I think it likely also that the storm of hail was

of brief duration, say 10 or 15 minutes, and that it embraced a very limited area.

It was, perhaps, about over when I took the train, as I infer from the fact that I have seen no account of it in the papers; and I found at the next station, only 5 miles off, that the road was dry and dusty.

I regret exceedingly that no more accurate observations seem to have been made of what must have been a most notable hailstorm, and I diffidently submit my own crude and imperfect account in the hope that thereby something further may be elicited in regard to it.

CHAS. H. WINSTON.

RICHMOND COLLEGE, VA.,

August 25, 1897.

#### THE DEATH OF VICTOR MEYER.

MANY years will pass before Heidelberg entirely recovers from the shock produced by the recent sudden death of Victor Meyer. That so great a man should depart in such a way, and in the prime of his life, seems to be the regret of all who knew his accomplishments.

The work of the semester was practically at an end and the majority of the students had left for the long vacation. It had been a very busy and fruitful period for the department. Every desk had been taken and many applicants turned away. Each student seemed proud of the privilege to work under such distinguished professors, chief among whom was Victor Meyer. His masterly leadership, scholarly attainments and genial manner were the constant inspiration of every one. On the 5th of August he had drawn to a close his annual course of lectures on experimental chemistry. After lingering for a moment to discuss the composition and decay of organic matter, and thanking his listeners for their faithfulness, he left the hall amid deafening and prolonged applause.

Returning from a social gathering rather late Saturday evening, he retired to his room, with the request that he be not disturbed on the following morning. When the door was forced open at noon by the anxious family he had already been dead some time, and the cyanide bottle by the bedside told the story.

When it was first reported that the beloved teacher had died by his own hand, not even his

most intimate friends would believe it, and to many the matter is still an enigma. He seemed too great a philosopher to countenance such an act. It is not improbable that temporary insanity shattered his mind. No expert opinion has been published. Although the fact was seldom noticeable, the great chemist was a very nervous man and had for an extended period been under medical treatment, but without great avail. During the previous winter he was forced to reduce the number of his lectures, but he persisted to the last in assuming all the responsibilities that fall upon a director of so large an institution. The strain was too great. For the last four days he was unable to sleep at all, and the man whose face was still as quiet and pleasant as ever was probably distracted by the fear that the physical forces which had served him so well were threatened with destruction. Only those who have suffered as he did can rightly judge the man. Certain it is that the annoying rumors, circulated by irresponsible reporters, are without any foundation. Of the two letters found on his desk, one expressed his love for his family in most endearing terms. The other was a farewell to his close friend, Kuehne, the famous physiologist.

On account of his expressed wish and because the semester had closed, elaborate ceremonies were avoided. As the quiet assemblage, including many famous scholars, stood around the grave, wreath after wreath was laid at its head. The venerable Bunsen, to whom Victor Meyer went at the age of sixteen to learn chemistry, sent a laurel from his home near by. Adolph von Baeyer came from Munich with a wreath 'to his best friend.' The German Chemical Society paid a tribute to its lost President, and the grand-ducal family of Baden sent a token. Among the many other wreaths was one bearing the words, 'Dem grossen Lehrer in Dankbarkeit, Seine Amerikanischen Schüler.' Heidelberg suffers a great loss, not only as a university, but as a city, for Victor Meyer was a citizen, as well as a scientist, and, while he was profoundly versed in every department of chemistry, he found time to encourage the development of the fine arts.

It is fortunate that there remain such splendid representatives of his school as those who have

been his assistant professors. The vacant chair may not be filled for some months. Temporarily the direction of the laboratory is in the hands of Professor Gattermann, who is pushing so rapidly to the front of his science. The other professors, Jannasch, Auwers, Goldschmidt and Knoevenagel are all well-known investigators, and have their own large circles of admiring students.

H. C. COOPER.

HEIDELBERG, August 15, 1897.

#### THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL SESSION AT TORONTO.

IT may be worth a few lines in *SCIENCE* to say a word in correction of the many erroneous and even ludicrous newspaper reports of the above meeting which suggest to the memory the famous definition of the crab by the French Academy before it was criticised by Cuvier.

The paleolithic or neolithic age of the New London stone axe was not a subject of discussion, as reported, simply because there was no room for two opinions on the matter. It is beyond all question neolithic, as every archæologist would be ready to assert at a glance.

Nor was any attempt made to prove that American man was older than European man, because again the evidence is so far absolutely conclusive on the other side. The paleoliths of Europe antedate all relics yet known from this continent.

Nor, thirdly, was any attempt made to prove the existence of preglacial man in America. The speakers who claimed the greatest antiquity advocated nothing more than a late glacial date for the oldest traces of human handiwork in this country.

As these three points formed the chief part of many of the reports of the meeting, it is easy to see how far short they fell of correctly representing the speakers.

E. W. CLAYPOLE.

#### SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE.

##### THE GENESIS OF THE DIAMOND.

THERE has recently been published a volume of small size, but of especial interest and importance, in regard to the origin of diamonds.

This is none other than the posthumous issue of the full papers of the late Professor H. Car-